

11

SOUND ARGUMENT

DICTATED

BY COMMON SENSE.



6
GK
SOUND ARGUMENT

1
DICTATED

BY COMMON SENSE;

IN

ANSWER

TO

NATHANIEL BRASSEY HALHED'S

TESTIMONY

OF THE

AUTHENTICITY

OF THE

PROPHECIES OF RICHARD BROTHERS,

And his pretended Mission to Recal the Jews.

BY

GEORGE HORNE, D. D. K

NOLI CREDERE, POPULUS, SED QUI VULT DECIPI, DECIPIATUR.

THE SECOND EDITION,

OXFORD:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR,

And sold by T. Booley, Old Broad Street; J. Lee, New Street, Covent Garden; B. Crosby, Stationers' Court, Ludgate Street; J. Binns, Leeds; Mudie and Son, Edinburgh; J. Hurst, Wakefield; N. Rollason, Coventry; and the principal Booksellers in Oxford, Cambridge, Norwich, &c.

FOUND ARGUMENT

THE COMMONS

AND

THE HOUSE OF LORDS

BRITISH MUSEUM



CRI
oft-m
astray
and an
texts
ed), i
consec
for an
culous
hed, M
was t
argum
in de
writte
visit t
aged

INTRODUCTION.

CREDULITY is a sad misfortune in the oft-misguided million: they are generally led astray by what is strange and wonderful, and any thing seemingly supported by a few texts of scripture (no matter how misapplied), is frequently attended with dangerous consequences. My chief design, therefore, for answering the curious—I must add ridiculous—pamphlet of *Nathaniel Brassey Halhed*, Member of Parliament for Lymington, was to obviate those idle and far-fetched arguments which were so rashly advanced in defence of an enthusiast. After I had written a few pages, I had the curiosity to visit this *supposed* prophet, who is a middle aged man, of mild aspect, rather tall and slender

slender, his hair cut remarkably short, and his attire plain. He asked me, if I had read his book. I answered in the affirmative; for I understand, if I had signified the contrary, he would have declined all further conversation. He then talked in a wild, unconnected manner, referring me (as Mr. Halhed remarks) to the scriptures: in short, his whole behaviour testified a disordered mind; and I think those medical gentlemen who have declared him insane, had very just foundation for their opinion. I asked him some questions relative to the reported death of the empress of Russia; but he declared that she was not dead, not would she die a *natural* death, but suffer *according to his prediction*. I looked upon this as a piece of policy, for had he allowed the fallacy of his prophecy in this respect, of course the *whole* must be esteemed a fiction. Indeed, he insinuated, that the report of her death was a meer fabrication, in hopes to confute him, as if it were worth the while of any one to propagate such a tale, for the sake of *proving* Mr. Brothers. Seeing that there was

was n
press's
with
that it
and th
for th
pleased
more
versatio
desirou
ling to
age. M
he has
persuas
have sti
lish his
appreh
ing, he
frenzy a
ferred m
in his pa
infallible
own gro
tle troub
readers)

was no downright confirmation of the empress's death, I did not attempt to argue with him upon that point; only observed, that it was in general believed to be true, and that I thought there were some grounds for the news. Mr. Brothers seemed displeased at being doubted, and hesitated more than once in his replies. Our conversation was but short, there being others desirous of seeing him, and I being unwilling to be accounted one of the *fools of the age*. My opinion of this character is, that he has been weak enough to listen to the persuasions of some designing men, who have stimulated him, without doubt, to publish his book, for the purpose of promoting apprehension and sedition; while, in so doing, he has worked himself up to a state of frenzy and enthusiasm. As this man has referred me to the scriptures, and Mr. Halhed in his pamphlet pretends to argue from those infallible guides, I shall meet him *on his own ground*; presuming that, with very little trouble, I shall (to the satisfaction of all readers) confute the arguments of the one, and

and thereby shew the insignificancy of the other's prophecies. It is a task, I must own, which affords but little pleasure; for what honor can be derived from a subject so futile and contemptible! But as silence, in this case, would be a seeming approbation of those vile threats and follies, it is the prerogative of every true-born Englishman to shew, that he is not to be alarmed by mere words or air.

SOUND

SOUND ARGUMENT, &c.

HOW any man of common understanding can avowedly attempt to defend the infanity, or, at least, the *profanity* of RICHARD BROTHERS, is to me astonishing. By meer accident the rodомontade stuff of that enthusiastic writer fell into my hands—a cursory view was sufficient—I thought no more of it; but when Mr. Halhed, a MEMBER of PARLIAMENT, stood up in his defence, I own that I was both astonished and ashamed, nor, at the moment of wonder, could I forbear exclaiming

NATHANIEL, NATHANIEL, *quæ te dementia cepit?*

Therefore the next question which I recommend to the *Debating Society* (who have already

B

pronounced

pronounced the prophet insane), is—Which is more mad, or enthusiastic—the *Offender*, or his *Defender*?

WHO, and WHAT, is this *foreseeing* Brothers? We are told, by himself, he is “The Man (*God Almighty's Nephew*) that will be revealed to the Hebrews as their prince, to all nations as their governor, according to the covenant to king David, immediately under God.” Must not the ears of every pious christian tingle at the horrid expression, but more particularly when defended? We are told that Brothers is a second Moses—and I suppose his Defender is a second AARON, who is appointed to support this meek and modest man, *slow of speech*, and of a *slow tongue*, by his eloquent and powerful arguments. To prove the defender a second AARON, would, I confess, be an easy task; for, from his own words, he is devoted to idolatry; seeing, that through BRIBERY and CORRUPTION he could part with his own soul! Says our blessed Redeemer, What is a man who parts with his soul? but the prophet, whom you believe,
may

may tell you, " This night (or after the earthquake) thou shalt be with me in Paradise." Let us, however, observe how judiciously Mr. Halhed vindicates the title which the sham prophet assumes, of *God Almighty's Nephew*,

" I sincerely hope there is no man in this country who will openly deny that Jesus Christ is God Almighty—if there be, I speak not to him—I am sure no Member of the established Trinitarian Church can safely say otherwise.—Now if Jesus Christ had brothers and sisters, as is expressly proved from the gospel, the son of any one of those must necessarily have been *his Nephew*. Extend the line of filiation as far as we please, through 50, 100, or 1000 descents, the last is still a nephew, lineally descended from the first, in the same manner as every Jew, to this day, is a son of Abraham, as we are all of us, beyond all doubt, the sons of Adam —."

And pray, Mr. Halhed, where is it expressly mentioned, in the gospel, that Mary, the mo-

of Jesus, had *sons* and *daughters*? Both Mr. Halded and his *friend* seem totally unacquainted with the original meaning of the word *brother*: which, among the ancients, was used with greater latitude than at present; and applied, indifferently, to almost all who stood related, in the collateral line, as uncles, nephews, first cousins, &c. &c. in which latter sense it is thought to be used in the gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark, and by St. Paul, &c. *And his brethren*, (meaning, says the sham prophet, *brothers*, as if every school-boy did not know that *brethren* and *brothers* were the plural number) *James, and Josés, and Simon, and Judas, and his sisters* (i. e. *their sisters*, or our Saviour's first cousins in the female line, *sisters* being used here with the same freedom as *brethren*) *are they not all with us?* &c. (*Matthew*, ch. 13, v. 55). Now if James, and Josés, and Simon, and Judas, were not born till after Christ, one would think they would be too *young*, at this time, to have any business with our Saviour (chap. 12, v. 46). Our Saviour extends the meaning of the words *brother*

ther and
does h
(v. 50
decla
suppo
have
part,
the or
and t
be i
young
ther,
styled
of Jer
enoug
brother
to ca
I
stand
much
holy
puzzl
shap

ther and sister, by saying, that every one that does his will is *his brother, and sister, and mother*, (v. 50). The sham prophet, without hesitation declares James to be the *eldest son*, because, I suppose, he is the *first* mentioned; he might have been, for aught we can tell: but, for my part, I think the names are *promiscuously* written, for the order differs in this chapter of St. Matthew, and the 6th of St. Mark, whereby it would be impossible to ascertain which was the *youngest*. St. Paul calls James the Lord's brother, by the same rule, who was likewise styled (as we are informed) *James the less, bishop of Jerusalem*. Your defence might have been well enough, had the prophet called himself *Christ's brother*, seeing that *his* father we are authorized to call *ours*!

I presume, Mr. Halhed, that you understand common ænigmas and conundrums much better than the visions and phrases in holy scripture—indeed you deal in *paradoxes and puzzles*. You say the Holy Ghost may have no shape; then declare that he actually appeared

as a dove, when Jesus Christ was baptized in Jordan, which, you presume, no believer in the gospel will contest with you. Now I do; for I believe the translation erroneous, and that the true meaning is, *the spirit of God descended as a dove* WOULD DESCEND, and not as a dove ITSELF. Should this be the real meaning (as several learned divines imagine) what are we to think of Mr. Brothers, who specifies even the hue of the dove—*silver coloured?* I fear it was a *false spirit* that he saw.

Our blessed Redeemer has enjoined us to *beware of false prophets, which come to us in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravenous wolves.* It is therefore the duty of every pious christian to be slow in belief, and not give ear to the *meer ipse dixit* of a madman.—But—*Qui vult decipi decipiatur.*

I think, if I confute Brothers in any one particular, the whole of his prophecies must fall to the ground. He calls himself *Jesus Christ's Nephew.* Where are those miracles, which evinced the glory of the Son of God? Is the

nephew

nephew
equal
Durin
a div
water
fes-li
bat o
serper
mon
the T
has th
and
and t
take
of hi
chapt
the p
confir
the d
20th
Richa
fully

nephew inadequate to the task? Has he not equal power to cure the lame, the blind, &c.? During such hard times as these, it would be a *divine* action to *feed multitudes*, to turn our *water into wine*, or, as water is now scarce, Moses-like, the *rocks into water*! Where is the probat of his being a *second Moses*? Where is his serpent-rod? for any one can display a common one,—his leprous hand? Will he divide the Thames, that we may walk through it? He has threatened to plague us, indeed, with *darkness* and *earthquakes*; but let him send *locusts* and *lice*, and then we shall believe. Let us, however, take a view of Brothers's modest asseveration of himself: He tells us (p. 65) that the 18th chapter of *Deuteronomy* refers to him; that he is the prophet, there promised, *like unto Moses*, and confirmed (ver. 18) by the LORD! I wonder the denunciation against *false prophets*, in the 20th verse of this chapter, did not strike Richard Brothers with awe.—Let him carefully peruse it.

Some

Some commentators imagined this prophet, which was promised by Moses, was Joshua, from *Ecclus.* ch. 46, v. 1, because he was Moses's successor (*Joshua*, ch. 1, v. 1) and God was with him as he was with Moses (v. 17). Yet in the 34th chapter of *Deuteronomy* (v. 10) we read, *There arose not a prophet in Israel like unto Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face.* If this passage was added after Moses's death, as some declare, by Joshua himself, then he consequently excludes himself from being a prophet like unto Moses. Some think it was Jeremiah, with less reason; others, a succession of prophets:—but surely the word is in the singular number; and if the above verse was added, as some declare, by Ezra, neither Jeremiah, nor the rest of the prophets, were meant; nor Brothers, I am sure; for when did he *see the Lord*? As yet he has not had the arrogance to declare he did. Certainly our blessed Redeemer, who held communion with the Father, is the prophet here alluded to, as is confirmed by the testimony of St. Peter, which Brothers *artfully* endeavours to do away. That Christ was *like to Moses*, has in many instances

instances been proved. Eusebius, who is very copious on this subject, draws a parallel between them; and though the one was a man, and the other God in human nature, the resemblance is striking, sin only excepted. It is observed by Dr. Jortin, that Moses in his infancy was preserved, when the rest of the children were destroyed; so was our Saviour when Herod commanded all the innocents to be put to death. Can Brothers produce a more striking, or *as* striking a similitude? Moses also fled from his country to escape the wrath of Pharaoh; and Joseph likewise took Christ to Egypt, to preserve him from the rage of Herod. However, Brothers may hereafter boast that he fled from his country to escape *Bedlam* or *Newgate*. Again—Moses refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter; and Christ, though the Son of God, would not accept of the temporal kingdom of the Jews. But Brothers, I dare say, would *see no more visions*, if those he applied to, offered him a *golden key* for his mouth. Add to this, Moses was learned in all the accomplishments of the Egyptian schools; and likewise

Christ, when only twelve years of age, was capable of disputing with the most experienced of the Jewish doctors. Poor Brothers, I think, cannot be so vain as to think himself assimilated to Moses in this respect. His Prophecies Mr. Halhed acknowledges to be "replete with grammatical faults, destitute of harmony of arrangement and elegance of diction." To prove a greater similarity between Christ and Moses, the latter we find contended with the Egyptians, and the former cast out devils; but Brothers, though he complains bitterly of the *evil spirits* which infest London, has not proved the ability of banishing them. Moses foretold the calamities which would come upon the children of Israel:—so did Christ. Moses interceded for sinners:—Christ laid down his life as a ransom for them. Moses instituted the Passover:—Christ instituted the Eucharist. Moses set up the brazen serpent in the wilderness:—and Christ was lifted up on the cross, that he might draw all men unto him. Moses was a law-giver:—so was Christ. And can all these similitudes be the effect of mere chance? or did not the

the
foreto
of un
ter of
Bro
Christ
forth
say,
long
all or
main
of th
at th
any
God
Man
phet
like
being
upon
taken
Gosp
know

the one take place in consequence of its being foretold by the other, who spoke by the direction of unerring Wisdom? It is added, in this chapter of Deuteronomy, that if this prophet (which BROTHERS pretends is himself, and which I say is Christ) should be rejected, then God would pour forth his fury on the people: and will any man say, *That has not happened?* The Jews have been long ago outcasts from the common privileges of all other people; and yet they are suffered to remain on the earth, as an evidence of the Truth of those books which they profess to believe, but at the same time wrest to their own ruin. Can any man of ordinary understanding suppose that God would dishonor his Son so much as to send a *Man-prophet* after him? No. Christ is the prophet Moses foretold; and who could be more like to him, for the reasons already given? Christ being *as a man*, and *suffering and acting* like Moses upon the earth. But has not our Saviour himself taken notice of this prophecy of Moses in the Gospel of St. John, which gospel Brothers acknowledges to be *authentic*? Certainly he alludes

to the declaration of Moses, that they should hearken unto this prophet (meaning himself)—*Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father—there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust; for had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me, FOR HE WROTE OF ME, (John, ch. 5, v. 45, 46)* Brothers pretends that his visions (as he calls them), are words put in his mouth, that he should speak all that he was commanded (according to ver. 18). Now what Moses meant by these words was, that the prophet, who was to be sent, should declare the will of God, to his people, in a free and familiar manner. This our blessed Lord and Saviour did: his doctrines were both confirmed by miracles, and calculated to promote the good of mankind. The prediction against those *who did not hearken to his words*, was remarkably fulfilled in the severe judgment executed upon the Jewish nation, for their cruel treatment of the prophets in general, and of the Messiah in particular: the horrors, discord, and distress, which preceded the taking of Jerusalem, by Titus, are not to be paralleled in history,

history, ancient or modern. I have desired BROTHERS to read the 20th verse, and tremble ! Let him also read the last in this chapter : *When a prophet speaketh, in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken of it presumptuously, thou shalt not be afraid of him.* A pretender to divine mission was always considered as an impostor, if the prophecy or miracle, upon which he founded his pretensions, did not come to pass. But he was not always to be considered as a true prophet *when it did.* He was not to be looked upon in that light, except the prophecy, or miracle, was calculated to support a doctrine *worthy of the Almighty !* BROTHERS prides himself upon having foretold some events relative to France—I, myself, predicted the unhappy Queen's death ; yet I am *no prophet.* We needed no conjurors to come and tell us many things, which then it was easy enough to anticipate.

Having delivered the many instances of striking similitude between our Redeemer and Moses, let

let us, a while, examine the pretended likeness of BROTHERS (as defended by Mr. Halhed). "The parallel (he writes) between the two "personages, Mr. Brothers states to have tallied hitherto, and, he asserts, will continue to "do so; for as Moses ascended from the ark "of bull-rushes, so did Mr. Brothers arise from "a ship, having been bred to the navy."—Amazing similitude! But pray how many others, besides Mr. Brothers, are like to Moses *in this respect*? But to proceed:—"That this coincidence of characters might be evident, at first sight, Mr. Brothers asserts, that, by the command of God himself, he cut a wand in "1792, which is to perform, precisely, the same "miracle with the former wand of Moses." Herein Brothers has acted very unlike Moses; for Moses, instead of telling the people that he had cut a wand some time ago for the purpose of changing it to a serpent, performed, with his rod, the miracle *at once*; but Brothers's wand is *still* to perform it. There is no great art required in *cutting a wand*, nor has Moses,

Moses, in his history, ascertained, like Brothers, *when*, or by *what means*, he procured his rod. The bold assertion, that Mr. Brothers had an intercourse with God, exceeds all the blasphemy that ever I heard!—In what *fiery-bush* did God appear to him?—All the prophets, which succeeded Moses, pretend not to this honor. Our Saviour alone held communion with the Father; and, in the hearing of multitudes, a voice from Heaven addressed him. As Moses was born in Egypt, so *London*, Mr. Halhed has endeavoured to prove (which I shall answer hereafter) from St. John in the Revelations (*which I am sure neither he nor his prophetic friend understand*) is spiritually called SODOM, in Egypt; this, of course, infers that Brothers, being born in London, *alias* EGYPT, is still more like to Moses. But in this he has materially hurt the GREAT PROPHET, who, I am surprised, was not *warned in a vision* to correct him: for Brothers himself has, in NEW-GATE (a place where Moses never was), declared that HE WAS NOT BORN IN LONDON. Prophets,
modern

modern ones I mean, who are otherwise called LYARS, should have *good memories*.

I have already said that Brothers has *artfully* endeavoured to contradict those passages, in the Acts of the holy apostles, where Christ is proved to be *that prophet which was promised*. It is now expedient that I should speak more copiously upon this subject.

Brothers has quoted some parts of the 7th chapter, it being (he said) misunderstood by expounders of the scripture, and as *he is commanded to insert and explain it for the benefit of all men*. But he only slightly mentions the 3d chapter, which, as it *precedes* the 7th, I shall *first* take into consideration, and thereby confute Mr. Brothers.

Acts, chap. 3, ver. 22. *For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord God raise up unto you of your Brethren like unto me: him shall you hear in all things, whatsoever he shall say unto you.*

Now Mr. Halhed, and Mr. Brothers, I must beg leave to remark, that the word TRULY, in the first line of this verse, implies the *then* accomplishment

accomplishment of this prediction in the coming of our Saviour:—Otherwise how could St. Peter have declared that Moses *had* TRULY said?

Verse 24. *Yea, and all the prophets from Samuel, and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, have likewise foretold of these days—*

The primary word of this verse (*yea*) unites it with the preceding—so that it is not any fresh matter the apostle is introducing, but still confines himself to the subject of *that* prophet whom Moses alluded to; and the concluding words, *of these days*, imply the coming of the Messiah and his kingdom. How, therefore, can Mr. Brothers dare (page 68) to assert, that St. Peter, herein, does not mean that Christ is the prophet alluded to by Moses?

From this chapter Mr. Brothers has made no quotations; and he has skipped several verses in the 7th, *though he was commanded to insert and explain it*. One verse, however, addressed to the Jews, I shall take the liberty of inserting for him.

D

Verse

Verse 52: *Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted? And they have slain them which shewed before of the coming of the Just One, of whom ye have been now the betrayers and murderers.*

But it was policy in Mr. Brothers to omit this verse, as he could not then arrogate in the least degree the dignity and honour of being that *Just One*, of whom Moses prophesied. But I should be glad to be informed, if *Richard Brothers* was indeed the prophet promised, why the subject was introduced by St. Peter, and St. Stephen, at this critical period, when so foreign to the purpose? We are told, in the preceding chapter, that certain synagogues arose disputing with Stephen, and that men were suborned, which said, *We have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses and against God: For we have heard him say, that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered us,* (ver. 11, 14). On this account the saint was brought to the council, and I presume that he had no occasion to mention that one *BROTHERS* would be hereafter born to alarm

alarm old women with his bombastic prophecies. It behoved him to prove that Jesus of Nazareth was the prophet that Moses had promised. Had he insinuated that another prophet was to come, after Jesus, he would have condemned himself, and his enemies have had just occasion for accusing him of blasphemy against Moses:—which blasphemy was *changing the customs*, that is, giving new laws. Moses was the law-giver till the coming of the *second* prophet, and this is what increases the similarity between the Man-prophet and the God-prophet! What LAWS has BROTHERS issued forth yet; and when he does, WHO WILL OBEY THEM?

I cannot but admire the great craft which has been made use of by this sham prophet, in chusing the most intricate parts of the scripture to answer the purpose of deception: he continually refers to the Apocrypha and Revelations for his prophecies and probats—Now our blessed Saviour always referred us to the most comprehensive parts of the holy scripture. But I wonder Mr. BROTHERS would insert the

book of Esdras under the appellation of *Apocrypha* (which Greek word signifies writings of uncertain authority), as thereby he gives just occasion to *doubt* the veracity of his assertions.

Mr. Brothers, when an officer in the navy, says, that he had always a pre-sentiment of being some time or other very great; and, as now he seems positive of his exaltation, recommends to every person to read the 13th chapter of the book of Esdras to the 13th verse, *as it means himself*. I think it rather extraordinary that he should stop at this particular verse, *where there is no period*; or that the reader should not go on *further*, where there is an interpretation of all those preceding verses. The matter which Brothers thus presumptuously assumes to himself, is the vision of a man coming out of the sea, who was to deliver the people; and in verse 32, it is explained—*then shall my son be declared, (i. e. the Son of God) whom thou sawest as a man ascending*. BROTHERS, I grant, has made a quotation from this part, but he has not attempted to illustrate it:—
only

only he harps upon those words *coming up from the midst of the sea*, as an allusion to his being in the navy; as if no other person could boast, at present, of having had that honor. But Mr. Brothers's advocate has thought proper to inform us, that the word *sea* cannot be taken literally, "as, in allegorical writings, every word is a portion of the allegory." Herein I agree with Mr. Halhed; and this very remark of his confutes the assertion of his friend, *the prophet*: for if the word *sea* be allegorical, as no doubt it is, it cannot possibly allude to Mr. Brothers' being *in the navy*.

Mr. Halhed is conscious that the 2d book of Esdras has been always esteemed fabulous; and, indeed, his account concerning the retreat of the ten tribes is so inconsistent, and full of uncertain traditions, that very little credit ought to be given to it. However, much industry has been displayed to appropriate the 11th chapter, of this *doubtful* book, to the *present times*. However, in verse 40, &c. of the 13th chapter, it is evident that Esdras alluded to

to *past* times. Never did people experience the unhappy revolutions, therein prophesied, more amply than the kingdom of Israel, otherwise called the kingdom of the *ten tribes*: who, in consequence of their sin, were carried away captive by Tig-lath-pileser and Salmanaser his son, kings of Assyria, and never more returned to their native country, religion, or government. The place to which these ten tribes were transported, and whether there are any vestiges of them yet remaining, are subjects that have exercised the pens of the ablest authors in all ages; especially as the descendants of the other two tribes have strenuously asserted, that their captive brethren have, all along, lived in great prosperity and grandeur, in some unknown land; as a national and united body, in an independent state, and under monarchies and republics of their own. By the 2d book of Kings, chap. 17, ver. 6, it is expressly mentioned, that the Israelites were carried into two distinct places, namely, Assyria and Media, and that they were scattered and dispersed, in lesser bodies, over the

the whole face of the earth. In short, though Artaxerxes in his commission to Esdras, gave free liberty to all the Jews in his dominions to return to Jerusalem, if they were so minded, which some, without doubt, most gladly embraced; yet the main bulk of the ten tribes, being unwilling to remove, continued in the land of their captivity; therefore all these prophecies, which some have mistakingly applied to their return from Babylon, are certainly forerunners of a greater event—even their conversion and final restoration under the kingdom of the Messiah.

Of course, Brothers and his advocate, have advanced very *lame* authorities to corroborate their bold assertions. These passages, though twisted and tortured as they have been, have no affinity whatever to *the king of Prussia, &c. &c.* In like manner the prophet Daniel is played upon, and an absolute parody written upon his vision. Though great as Mr. Halhed thinks himself in decyphering mysterious and allegorical modes of composition, he has, in a very *forced* manner indeed, read the modern history of Europe, in the prophetic

prophetic records of the Old and New Testament. The key which he thinks Mr. Brothers has found for the *unlocking* of those secrets, is a *false one*, and serves only to spoil and entangle the whole. Give me leave, Prophet as thou pretendest to be, to set both thee and thy advocate right.

Daniel, chap. vii. ver. 2, &c. *I saw in my vision by night, and behold, the four winds of the heavens strove upon the great sea. And four great beasts came up from the sea, diverse from one another, &c. &c.*

In ancient times conquerors were always represented by different emblems. Thus ; a lion denoted force, an eagle rapidity, &c. &c. The first beast, which Brothers has the audacity to say is the king of England, was meant for Nebuchadnezzar, who was looked upon as a lion, till the conquests of his army were stopped, or, as the prophet expresses it, *his wings plucked*, by the joint forces of Cyrus and Darius, who made attacks upon the Babylonish empire for near twenty years before its final destruction. Here it is necessary to remark, both for Halhed's and Brothers's information, that this vision which the prophet had,

was

was *seventeen years* before the occurrences in the preceding chapter. The second beast (which is now prophesied to be the *Empress of Russia*,) is, with greater reason, understood to be the Persian empire, which gradually rose to its then state of power and greatness; and the *three ribs*, which Mr. Halhed *philosophically* interpreth *et tres appetits*, mean Babylon, Lydia, and E ; Cyrus having subdued Lydia in the time of Croesus, and Egypt being conquered by Nebuchadnezzar, still remained subject to the Babylonians, and consequently upon the reduction of the people became tributary to Cyrus.

I cannot but admire the great *ingenuity* Mr. Halhed has displayed in *taming and familiarizing the third beast*; but we are told, by naturalists, that a *leopard never was tamed*! Were the French, then, always ferocious? Notwithstanding all Mr. Halhed's illustrations, I fear Brothers's attempt to show that the third beast is a reference to the late king of France will be ineffectual. His expounder has laboured exceedingly to prove the parallel, but still, like other commentators, I do

E

believe

believe that the Grecian empire, under Alexander, is the just signification. And the 13th chapter of Revelation, which BROTHERS would fain persuade us means the death of Charles I. of England, and which Mr. Halhed looks upon as a corroboration of his *fanciful* assertions; is a fresh instance of much labour being spent in vain. All expositors of the Holy Scriptures have unanimously agreed, that the beast herein mentioned, *having seven heads, and ten horns*, implies the city of Rome, standing upon seven hills, and the ten kingdoms into which its dominions were to be divided.

To complete the *farcical* interpretation of this vision, we are told, that the fourth beast, which hitherto was always esteemed an allusion to the Roman empire, is the present Emperor of Germany; and the ten horns, the Electors or Princes of the Empire.—*Risum teneatis, Amici?* I am of opinion, that the ten horns (as I said before) denote the ten kingdoms into which the Roman Empire was divided. The vigilance and policy of the Roman Hierarchy (which became proverbial) are fully set forth by the horn *with eyes*, and the great turbulence
and

and disputations of those times, is the *mouth speaking great things*. In the interpretation given to Daniel, it is expressed that the ten horns out of this kingdom (i. e. *the fourth beast*) are ten kings, by which are meant *kingdoms*, and which is so translated by the Vulgate, Greek, and Arabic. If we fix the æra for these ten kingdoms, they will be found as follow:

- | | |
|-----------------|----------------|
| 1. Britons. | 6. Almons. |
| 2. Franks. | 7. Visigoths. |
| 3. Burgundians. | 8. Ostrogoths. |
| 4. Saxons. | 9. Greeks. |
| 5. Vandals. | 10. Suevians. |

Now the little horn is an allusion to the antichrist who should root up three of these ten kings, and domineer over the rest. The antichrist is acknowledged to be the Pope, who was to rise after the other, or, according to the Greek translation, *behind* them, for gradually growing, the ten kings were not aware of it till it overtopped them. The three first horns (or kingdoms) were to be plucked up by the roots, viz. the exaschate of Ravenna, the kingdom of Lombardy, and the senate of

Rome. The first was surrendered to the Pope by Pepin, king of France, A. D. 755; the second was subdued by Charles the Great, called Charlemagne of France, who resigned his pretensions to St. Peter, A. D. 774; the latter was invested by the Pope, by Lewis the Pious. The Pope, by wearing a *triple crown*, denoted these ~~three~~ triumphs; yet still he answered the character of a *little horn*, the power of the Popes being originally very trifling, and their temporal dominions very inconsiderable in comparison with the others of the *ten horns*. The words (ver. 23.) *he shall be diverse from all others, is, in the Greek and Arabic, he shall exceed in wickedness all before him.* Either sense, however, will correspond with *our* interpretation. The 25th verse, which is most terribly tortured by Brothers, is a strong corroboration of the *true meaning* of the vision. The remarks of Newton hereupon are exceedingly critical and just:—*And he shall speak great words against the most High, and wear out the saints of the most High:* that is, By wars, and massacres, and inquisitions, persecuting and destroying the faithful servants of Jesus, and the true worshippers
of

of God, who protested against this antichrist's innovations, and refused to comply with the idolatry then in practice. *He shall think to change times and manners*, by appointing fasts and feasts, canonizing saints, granting pardons and indulgences for sin, instituting new modes of worship, imposing new articles of faith, enjoining new rules of practice, and reversing at pleasure the laws both of God and man. *And they shall be given into his hand until a time, and times, and the dividing of time.* TIME implies a year, like A DAY, in the prophets; that is, a year, and years, and half a year, according to our late ingenious expositors, who have all agreed in their calculation.

Any false prophet, as well as BROTHERS, may, by a little study, pervert many passages of the Holy Bible to answer *private purposes*, particularly the parts that are allegorical and figurative. There are many examples in the sacred Writings, where tribes, kings, &c. are compared to beasts, and the like. The prophet Jeremiah has absolutely termed Nebuchadnezzar a lion, which corroborates the opinion, that the first beast in Daniel's

niel's

niel's vision *was* the king of Babylon—*Babylon*, in plain terms, neither SODOM nor LONDON! *Judah* is likewise compared to a lion in *Genesis*; *Issachar* to a strong ass; *Dan* to a serpent; *Naphtali* to a hind let loose; *Joseph* to a fruitful bough; *Benjamin* to a ravenous wolf, &c. &c. &c.

Conjectural emendations upon the Apocalypse, and the obscure prophets, have generally been attended with serious consequences. Hence originate fanaticism, atheism, &c. It is exceedingly difficult to draw out *mystical* meanings with sufficient certainty beyond what our infallible guides in the New Testament have already produced for us, or plainly indicated. The generality of such pretenders, thinking they have found a cue, or, as Mr. Halhed says, a key *for that purpose*, strain in such a violent manner, that they absolutely *force open* such heterogenous opinions, as to bewilder not only themselves, but all their readers. Part of the first book of Daniel, from the fourth verse of his second chapter to the end of the seventh, was originally written in the Chaldee language; a demonstration, that in *that part*

he

he treats of the Chaldean, or Babylonish affairs. The other six chapters, which are likewise prophetical, contain the future events of foreign princes, and kingdoms. St. Jerom informs us, that Porphyry objected to his prophecies concerning the coming of the Messiah, and the great events of after-times: consequently those which related to the kings of Syria and Egypt must have been written after the times of Antiochus Epiphanes. Those prophecies, foretelling the successes of Alexander, (chap. 8, ver. 5, and chap. 9, ver. 3,) were highly esteemed by Alexander himself, and were written in Hebrew.

I totally disagree with Mr. Halhed in thinking that Mr. Brothers has, in a satisfactory manner, proved that Babylon (as mentioned in the 11th chapter of the Revelations), implies London. The prophecies of St. John, Daniel, Ezekiel, &c. chiefly refer to the Messiah, the time before, and the primitive christians. But let us remark this *satisfactory exposition*: he endeavours to shew, that the various and multiplied allusions to navigation and commerce, in the description
of

of this Babylon, cannot possibly be strained with any propriety to indicate an inland city, totally incapable of shipping, and remarkably destitute of trade. Now, Mr. Halhed, you, yourself, have remarked, in a preceding page, that the word *sea*, &c. cannot be taken literally; but, I suppose, we are to understand it allegorical or real, according to the interpretation Mr. Brothers wishes? How comes it that the Roman common-wealth is addressed, by Horace, under the picture of a *ship*? Rome was an inland city too—was it *London* the poet meant? Now Herodotus informs us that Babylon was exceedingly fertile, and, as it *abounded in fish*, there must have been some kind of navigation. Women were bought and sold, and were *slaves* in Babylon; and *souls of men* were wantonly abused, by the papistical notion of deliverance through purgatory. These, to the intelligent reader, must, undoubtedly, be more forcible arguments, than Halhed's curious acknowledgment (as already remarked), of having *disposed of his soul*, by the way of a *probatum est*.

That

That all Londoners make a merchandise of their
—thus he writes:—

“ Must I speak out? (says Mr. Halhed) must I produce an instance? Well, then, I have an instance: I myself am that instance, and the Speaker is a living witness to the truth of my assertion. There has he sat in his chair, day after day, for three years together, beholding me crouched behind the Treasury Bench, with my soul in my hand, like a country girl in the market with her butter and eggs before her, anxiously waiting for the lucky moment when the Tellers would come and rid me of my burthen, that I might run home and hide myself. And while I *did* sell my soul, it was all in the true spirit of commercial credit that so peculiarly distinguishes this country: I sold it purely upon trust; *I never have received one shilling*; and now I am taught by experience to apprehend that the purchaser will never pay me one farthing for it. But though I sold my soul, I could never sell my tongue. While the one loitered an abandoned prostitute in the market,

the other remained fullenly immoveable at home. The emancipation of the former would have opened the prison doors of the latter—could I have caught the Speaker's eye! But it is of no consequence now—*Liberavi animum meum*—and both my soul and my tongue are from henceforth at liberty.”——

Not *your tongue*, Mr. Halhed, for there are few in the house ever heard you *speak*. But you have given liberty, indeed, to your pen, when thus you have undertaken to defend a prophet (as he calls himself), who predicts the destruction of our nation—and all for what? because you have already confessed, *you never received a shilling*. Then pray, Mr. Halhed, how did you sell your soul! You offered it *for sale*, but it was not *purchased*—it was not worth *one farthing*. Seeing then you have *redeemed your soul—sold*, yet *never bought*—pray now endeavour to recover your *senses*.

In this chapter of the Revelations we read (verse 2), *Babylon the Great is fallen, is fallen!* which is the true spirit of prophecy, for the
fourth

fourth verse sufficiently ascertains that Babylon was *then* standing. The calamities denounced respecting merchandise, &c. have a strong affinity to those *against Tyre*, which the prophet, Ezekiel, mentions in chap. 27, ver. 26, 27, &c.

London, Mr. Brothers says, is likewise known by the name of *Sodom*; and for this purpose the 11th chapter of Revelation is perverted, but *the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom, in Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified, is Rome, the Lord being crucified there afresh, in the sufferings of his faithful martyrs.*

I cannot but admire the cunning, as well as fertility, of Brothers's genius; he has artfully guarded himself against the non-fulfilment of any of his prophecies. Dreadful things (he tells us) were to happen, but they are prevented by his entreaties: we are, therefore, to suppose that the Almighty forbears his determinations through *his* intercessions. Christianity has taught us another doctrine: Christ is our mediator alone. By this *sagacious* method, Brothers, if *convinced* that the empress of Russia has died a *natural*

death, will fain persuade us it was on account of his praying, that the evil, threatened against her, was turned away. According to this rule, there is no very great art in being a prophet. This, however, Mr. Halhed has ingeniously defended, by proving that Abraham interceded for the preservation of Sodom, and by the 30th verse of the 22d chapter of Ezekiel, which he says points out Mr. Brothers *standing in the gap before the city, that he (the Lord) should not destroy it*—Thus Brothers is a *second Abraham*, as well as Moses. Nay, it seems that he has *greater influence*; for Abraham's solicitations did not save Sodom! Strange infatuation! I hope, when the earthquake comes, that Brothers will then be so kind as to *stand in the GAP*, and pray for the city.

Having now taken a critical review of Mr. Halhed's testimony, I shall beg leave to confine myself to Mr. Brothers's Prophecies, and conclude with some desultory remarks thereon.

Though Mr. Brothers, has created some alarm among *old Women*, yet it has been shrewdly remarked

remarked by several of those very people; that
 he *speaks too much of himself*. There are none of
 the Prophets, in the Sacred Writings, Egotists.
 How comes it then that Brothers should appro-
 priate so many pages to the *sounding* of his own
 name? The first verse, he says, of the 4th chap-
 ter of the prophet Isaiah appertains to him.
 Now this first verse belongs to the third chap-
 ter (the chapters being improperly divided) as
 it entirely alludes to the foregoing prophecy.
 He is likewise the ROARING LION in the 37th
 verse of the 11th chapter of the 2d book of
 Esdras:—now the prophet, in this chapter, al-
 ludes to the divisions that would take place,
 in the Jewish state, after the return from the
 Babylonish captivity; for the simile of an eagle
 (in the first verse), denotes power—and the di-
 vision of the feathers, public dissensions. The
 next chapter, which contains an interpretation
 of the vision (not according to that of Mr.
 Brothers), in the 32d verse, declares the lion to
 be the anointed of the Most High, the Messiah,
 which character Brothers assumes. But this is
 not

not his only presumptive declaration; seeing that he cannot deny the palpable allusions to the Messiah, in *some* places, he has the audacity to tell us that the Messiah and he are together meant in two succeeding verses, 30, and 31. But I shall leave it to any reader if they can find out *two persons* in these verses:

And He shall come, to the astonishment of them that dwell upon the earth.

And one shall undertake to fight against another, and one city against another, one people against another, and one realm against another.

Surely the coming of only *one* person is here denoted, and that person Brothers acknowledges to be CHRIST.

Mr. Brothers bids us "observe that the Revelation was given to St. John a long time after the death of Christ, not to commemorate those things which were before, which were fulfilled, and which were known before the time of writing it, but to record those things which are to be in future, and which are to be fulfilled. Now this *long time* after Christ, is, according to

Irenæus,

Irenæus, A. D; 96, when St. John was banished to the isle of Patmos, by the emperor Domitian. However, Sir Isaac Newton fixes the time of writing this book (with great propriety) in the time of Nero. Brothers, himself, agrees that the prophecies herein correspond with those of Daniel; of course they must appertain to the Messiah: and though they may not directly treat of his first coming, yet, in many places, they assuredly do of his *second*. St. John, as well as the rest of the apostles, St. Jude, &c. were employed in propagating the *Word*, and CHRIST is the chief person alluded to *as the judge*, in the Apocalypse.

We are told, by Brothers, that the two chapters of the prophet Haggai, mean the present time of the world, &c. Now Haggai, who prophesied in the 6th year of Darius Hystaspes, was inspired, for the purpose of encouraging the Jews to proceed with the rebuilding of the city and temple, after the foundation had been laid: for the people had built houses for themselves, but were unwilling to assist in rebuilding the Temple,

as

as appears from the 4th verse of the first chapter, and the 23d of the second, which Brothers has falsely interpreted, predicts, that the Messiah should be invested with power and authority, as the head of the church, and judge of the world.

Mr. Brothers says, that the messenger mentioned in the third chapter of the prophet Malachi, and the Elijah mentioned in the fourth chapter, are two distinct persons. Herein Mr. Brothers is mistaken. It is John the Baptist, only, who came in the spirit and power of Elias, preaching repentance; and that John the Baptist is signified by the name of Elijah, is apparent from *St. Matt.* ch. xvii. ver. 13. when our Saviour's disciples understood that their divine master meant John the Baptist by that title.

Every impartial reader must own, that Brothers's book is exceedingly dark and mysterious throughout. To misguide the million who are generally bewildered by a *quantity*, and are too apt to *believe*, what they cannot *comprehend*, we find several quotations from the scriptures, without any pretended application whatever. To add to the
mystery,

mystery, and render the cloud more thick, several words are put in Italics: in short, the more we read, the more we find that the writer is in a labyrinth. He introduces names unknown to the world, and runs on in such a bombastic style, that reason has evidently left her seat! He has given us the 6th chapter of the Revelation, as relating (he says) to the present war; this is the vision of the six seals; but Mr. Brothers, notwithstanding his quotation of the *whole*, afterwards alludes to the *fifth* and *sixth* seals. The *fifth*, he says, is now opened; the sixth is *to be* opened. In contradiction to Mr. Brothers's *foreseeing* abilities, I must observe, that the fifth seal is understood as an allusion to the severe persecution under Dioclesian, from A. D. 270, to A. D. 304, which was the most extensive and furious of all, for then so many Christians suffered death, that the heathens boasted, in an ancient inscription, that they had effaced the name and superstition of the Christians. Now the *sixth seal*, (which Brothers says is to be fulfilled) is ingeniously interpreted by Mr. Lowman, to refer to the great commotions in the empire,

pire; from Maximilian to Constantine the Great; during which time there were many bloody battles fought between the contending emperors, till Constantine abolished Paganism and established the Christian religion. This interpretation he confirms by apposite passages from Lactantius, and the heathen historians.

Brothers has laboured exceedingly to prove himself a prophet from the Holy Scriptures. But I think that which is most applicable to himself, is the 22d chapter of Kings, which he has forced into his work with a degree of imprudence, I think, as he might surely have foreseen that the allusion would have been made. This chapter is respecting false prophets, who were prompted by an evil spirit to tell lies. *And if the prophet be deceived when he hath spoken a thing, the Lord hath deceived that prophet, and the Lord will stretch out his hand upon him, and will destroy him from his people Israel,* (Ezek. ch. xiv. ver. 9.) These were prophets, like Mr. B. who prophesied out of their own hearts—foolish prophets, that followed their own spirit, and saw nothing of truth—they were such as had seen vanity and lying divination,

divination, pretending to be God's prophets, when the Lord had not sent them—they seduced the people. Thus the 12th chapter of Ezekiel displays a most admirable picture of the present anti-prophets.

Be not deceived, Brothers, for christian charity induces me to think that enthusiasm hath taken so great possession of your mind, that you do not see the consequences of what you pretend to see. Fanatics have frequently brought upon themselves dire calamities, and while bewildered with strange fancies, have not only deceived the weak and credulous, but in the end proved themselves the greatest dupes of wild imagination. I must say, that I think you have arrogated more than any of the real prophets ever did. You call yourself a Moses—Nephew of Christ—Son of God—a bright Star—a Sound of Thunder in the Ears of the Wicked—a Lantern to the Jews—a Great Man!!! &c. Now the Apostles, &c. were content to be esteemed the *humble servants* of God, and to *suffer shame for his name*—You think there is nothing in your book that the English law can take hold of; without being a *Wonderful Counsellor*, I must beg leave

leave to set you to rights—Persons pretending to prophecies, are punishable at common law. By statute, likewise, if any person publish such *prophecies*, &c. they shall forfeit 10l. for the first offence, and suffer a year's imprisonment, and for the second, incur the forfeiture of all their goods, &c.

It is unnecessary to add any further remarks upon the fallacy and folly of Brothers's predictions—He may see whatever visions his fancy presents, and think what he likes, but the wise put no faith in *dreams*; and they who talk thereof, as Shakspear remarks—"talk of nothing." God hath already *revealed* his will, and it is impious to suppose that, *after his Son*, he would send such an humble prophet as—Brothers.



F I N I S.